

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,261 02/09/2004		Gyana Ranjan Parija	YOR920030256US1	8578
48150 7	7590 07/28/2006		EXAMINER	
	TELLECTUAL PRO URTHOUSE ROAD	FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN		
SUITE 200	OKTHOODE KOAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
VIENNA, VA	VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	No. of the control of		Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>		
			10/773,261	PARIJA ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	i	Examiner	Art Unit			
			Russell Frejd	2128			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication app	ears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence ac	ddress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Nations of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common some of the provision of the properties of the pro	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. tatutory period w y will, by statute,	TE OF THIS COMMUNION (6(a). In no event, however, may a rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB	CATION.  eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this of this of this of the control	,		
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>26 An</i>	ril 2005.				
			action is non-final.				
· —	Since this application is in condition	•		ers, prosecution as to the	e merits is		
,—	closed in accordance with the pract		•	•			
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the	application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a		n from consideration.				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or	election requirement.				
	on Papers						
		- <b>-</b>					
	The specification is objected to by the			and the Francisco			
10)[_]	The drawing(s) filed on is/are		•	<del>-</del>			
	Applicant may not request that any obje			· •			
111	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including				• •		
' ' '	The oath or declaration is objected to	o by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached	Oπice Action or form P	10-152.		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
_	2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority	documents	have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority			pplication No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies				Stage		
	application from the Internation						
* S	ee the attached detailed Office actio			received.			
			•				
Attachment	(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	_		
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F		Paper No(s	)/Mail Date	3.450)		
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date	PTO/SB/08)	6) Other:	formal Patent Application (PTC	J-152)		

In re Application of: Parija et al.

### Examination of Application #10/773,261

1. Claims 1-20 of application 10/773,261, filed on 9-February-2004, are presented for examination.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

- 2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

  Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 2.1 Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The invention claims (claim 1 preamble), "A computerized method for providing an optimization solution".
- 2.2 MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii) provides that a statutory computer process is determined not by how the computer performs the process, but by what the computer does to achieve a practical application with a useful, concrete and tangible result. For example, a computer process that simply calculates a mathematical algorithm that models noise is nonstatutory, while a claimed process for digitally filtering noise employing the mathematical algorithm is statutory. The long line of cases in this area that are referred to in MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii) exemplify this requirement, by utilizing in the claim language, terms such as controlling, executing, changing and removing. In view of the aforementioned requirement and the interim guidelines for 101 eligibility, the Examiner respectfully contends that the claim language of independent claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 13 and 14 do not claim a practical application with a tangible result, that language claiming: in claim 1:

In re Application of: Parija et al.

Ĵ,

**receiving** (emphasis added) data for a process which is defined by a linear functional form, including variables y,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ ;

**minimizing** y with respect to  $X_{1}$ ; and;

**maximizing** y with respect to  $X_2$ , wherein maximizing y comprises a global optimum for the process.

- 2.3 For at least these reasons, the Examiner respectfully posits that the claims of the present invention do not meet the criteria for a statutory process. Accordingly, the claims are determined to be a method for providing an optimization solution, consisting solely of mathematical operations, converting one set of numbers into another set of numbers, whereby the method does not manipulate appropriate subject matter, and thus cannot constitute a statutory process (MPEP Section 2106(iV)(B)(2)(c)).
- 2.4 The Examiner also posits that the method of the present invention is computer executable software code, or a program per se, consisting of software instructions that implement the method for providing an optimization solution. For at least this reason, the software instructions of the present invention do not manipulate appropriate subject matter, and thus cannot constitute a statutory process (MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(c)).

# Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

In re Application of: Parija et al.

١,

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or inpublic use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.1 Claims 5, 8 and 14 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whiffen, USP 6,496,741.

#### **3.2** Whiffen discloses:

Claim 5: an apparatus for calculating a global optimization to a minimum-maximum problem, said apparatus comprising: a first calculator to provide a plurality of minimum values; and a second calculator to locate a global optimum value, given said plurality of minimum values [col. 6, lines 28-36].

Claim 8: a system comprising: a memory [Fig. 12] containing data appropriate to a minimum-maximum problem; and an apparatus comprising: a first calculator to provide a plurality of minimum values; and a second calculator to locate a global optimum value, given said plurality of minimum values [col. 6, lines 28-36].

Claim 14: a computerized tool [Fig. 12] for providing a global solution to a minimum-maximum problem, said tool comprising: a linear programming solver to calculate a periphery of a polyhedron representing a region of all points that satisfy a linear constraint in a minimum-maximum problem [col. 6, lines 28-36; and Fig. 3, with col. 12, lines 8-33].

# Claim Objections

4. Claims 6, 7, and 15-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

In re Application of: Parija et al.

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Allowed Claims

5. Claims 1-4 and 9-13 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record at this time, pending resolution of any rejections noted above.

## Response Guidelines

- 6. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).
- 6.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday

from 0530 to 1400 ET, **or** the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100

Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

**Date:** 24-July-2006

RUSSELL FREJD, PRIMARY EXAMINER